UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/626,340	07/24/2003	Heng Chu	RSW920030074US1	9120

43168   7590   01/08/2009
MARCIA L. DOUBET LAW FIRM
PO BOX 422859
KISSIMMEE, FL 34742

EXAMINER
LOVEL, KIMBERLY M

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2167	

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
01/08/2009	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

mld@mindspring.com

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	10/626,340	CHU ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	KIMBERLY LOVEL	2167	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>21 September 2008</u>.
2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) <u>3-5,7-9,11-13,20,31 and 32</u> is/are pending in the application.
   4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) <u>3-5, 7-9,11-13, 20, 31 and 32</u> is/are rejected.
7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.
   Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
   Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
   a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:
   1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
   2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
   3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
   * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
   Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
   Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   Claims 3-5, 7-9, 11-13, 20 and 31-33 are currently pending and claims 1, 2, 6,

10, 14-19 and 21-30 are canceled.

2.   In view of the Pre-Brief Conference request filed on 21 September 2008,

PROSECUTION IS HEREBY REOPENED.

To avoid abandonment of the application, appellant must exercise one of the

following two options:

(1) file a reply under 37 CFR 1.111 (if this Office action is non-final) or a reply

under 37 CFR 1.113 (if this Office action is final); or,

(2) initiate a new appeal by filing a notice of appeal under 37 CFR 41.31 followed

by an appeal brief under 37 CFR 41.37. The previously paid notice of appeal fee and

appeal brief fee can be applied to the new appeal. If, however, the appeal fees set forth

in 37 CFR 41.20 have been increased since they were previously paid, then appellant

must pay the difference between the increased fees and the amount previously paid.

A Supervisory Patent Examiner (SPE) has approved of reopening prosecution by

signing below.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4.   **Claims 3-5, 7-9, 11-13, 20 and 31-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as**

being unpatentable over US Patent No 7,065,742 to Bogdan (hereafter Bogdan) in

view of US PGPub 2005/0149847 to Chandler (hereafter Chandler) in view of US

Patent No 7,458,082 to Slaughter et al (hereafter Slaughter).

Referring to claim 3, the combination Chandler and Bogdan and Slaughter

(hereafter Bogdan/Chandler/Slaughter) discloses the method according to Claim 32,

wherein the input document is a structured document [XML document] (Chandler: see

[0038], lines 1-2).

Referring to claim 4, Bogdan/Chandler/Slaughter discloses the method

according to Claim 3, wherein the structured document is encoded in Extensible Markup

Language ("XML") (Chandler: see [0038], lines 1-2).

Referring to claim 5, Bogdan/Chandler/Slaughter discloses the method

according to Claim 32, wherein the generated output comprises at least one object

representation generated from the input document (Bogdan: see column 2, line 56 –

column 3, line 44).

Referring to claim 7, Bogdan/Chandler/Slaughter discloses the method

according to Claim 33, wherein the second syntax level schema definition is requested

by specifying a schema name of the second schema definition, to which the generated

output must adhere (Chandler: see [0038], lines 15-19).

Referring to claim 8, Bogdan/Chandler/Slaughter discloses the method

according to Claim 33, wherein the second syntax level schema definition is requested

by specifying a schema name of the second schema definition, indicating that the

second schema definition is to be used by the validating parser when generating the

output (Chandler: see [0038], lines 15-19).

Referring to claim 9, Bogdan/Chandler/Slaughter discloses the method

according to Claim 8, wherein the schema name is specified, by the application

program, as a feature on an invocation of the validating parser (Chandler: see [0038]).

Referring to claim 11, Bogdan/Chandler/Slaughter discloses the method

according to Claim 32, wherein the identification of the first syntax level schema

definition in the input document comprises a specification, is specified in the syntax of

the input document, of the first schema definition (Chandler: see [0038]).

Referring to claim 12, Bogdan/Chandler/Slaughter discloses the method

according to Claim 32, wherein the identification of the first schema definition in

specification ha the syntax of the input document uses a schema location construct in

the input document (Chandler: see [0038]).

Referring to claim 13, Bogdan discloses a computer-implemented method of

casting objects, comprising:

providing a validating parser [XML parser] that is adapted for validating whether

syntax elements of an input document conform to a first schema [extended schema]

definition identified in the input document while generating output objects, from the

validated syntax elements of the input document, that conform to a second schema

definition dynamically selected by a consuming application of the generated output

objects [manner defined by the application] (see column 2, line 56 – column 3, line 44);

using the validating parser for validating whether the syntax elements of the input

document conform to the first schema definition, wherein:

the first schema definition is an extended schema [extended schema] (see

column 2, line 56 – column 3, line 44);

using the validating parser, responsive to the validating of the syntax elements,

for according to a first syntax level while generating the output objects to conform to the

from the input using the validating parser, according to a second syntax level schema

definition, wherein:

the second schema definition is a base schema [base UI hierarchy] from which

the extended schema was extended, such that the extended schema defines at least

one syntax element that is not defined in the base schema (see column 2, line 56 –

column 3, line 44); and

providing the generated output objects, by the validating parser, for use by the

consuming application program (column 3, lines 27-42).

Bogdan fails to explicitly disclose the further limitation wherein the first schema

definition is identified in the input document. Chandler discloses using, by a validating

parser, a first syntax level for validating syntax elements when parsing syntax of an

input document [the entire document is validated] (see [0037]), including the further

limitation wherein the first schema definition is identified in the input document (see

[0037]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention to utilize the method of Chandler for identifying the syntax level with the input

document of Bogdan. One would have been motivated to do so in order to increase

efficiency by providing only necessary elements to the application through the use of an

identified syntax level, thereby decreasing the amount of information received by the

application.

While the combination of Bogdan and Chandler (hereafter Bogdan/Chandler)

discloses application specific generation of objects (Bogdan: see column 3, lines 27-42),

Bogdan/Chandler fails to explicitly disclose the further limitation of the generating further

comprises suppressing, by the validating parser not generating any output object for

any of the at least one of the validated syntax element that is defined in the extended

schema but not defined in the base schema elements from the generated output objects

in order that the generated output objects will be valid according conform to the second

syntax level schema definition. Slaughter discloses the concept of a space containing a

base schema and a plurality of schema extensions, including the further limitation of the

generating further comprises suppressing, by the validating parser not generating any

output object for any of the at least one of the validated syntax element that is defined in

the extended schema but not defined in the base schema elements from the generated

output objects in order that the generated output objects will be valid according conform

to the second syntax level schema definition (see column 45, lines 4-35).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the
invention to utilize the limiting feature of Slaughter in order to limit the output of
Bogdan/Chandler to contain only objects that conform to the base schema. One would
have been motivated to do so in order to provide different levels of service to different
clients depending on the client's authentication.

Referring to claim 20, Bogdan/Chandler/Slaughter discloses the method
according to Claim 13, wherein: the first syntax level second schema definition is the
base schema; an intermediate schema definition extends the base schema by adding at
least one syntax element not defined in the base schema; and the first schema
definition extends the intermediate schema definition by adding at least one syntax
element not defined in the intermediate schema definition; and the generating further
comprises not generating any output object for any of the at least one syntax element
that is defined in the intermediate schema but not in the base schema represents a
plurality of extensions to the second syntax level (Bogdan: see column 11, lines 18-44).

Referring to claim 31, Bogdan discloses a computer-implemented method of
providing validation and parsing for clients, comprising steps of:

a validating parser [XML parser] adapted for validating an input document while
generating output, from the validated input document, according to a second schema
definition dynamically selected by a consuming application of the generated output (see
column 2, line 56 – column 3, line 44);

to dynamically select a syntax abstraction level for use when generating output
from the validating parser (see column 3, lines 27-42);

validating syntax elements of the input document with the provided validating

parser according to the first schema definition, wherein the first schema definition

validation is performed according to a first syntax level is an extended schema which

specifies a syntax definition to which the syntax elements of the input document are to

adhere (see column 2, line 56 – column 3, line 44); and

the syntax abstraction level is a less-restrictive version of the first syntax level;

and each of the suppressed syntax elements is valid according to the first syntax level

extended schema but is not valid according to the syntax abstraction level base schema

see (column 2, line 56 – column 3, line 44).

Bogdan fails to explicitly disclose the further limitations wherein the first schema

definition is identified in the input document and obtaining an input document to be

validated and parsed. Chandler discloses using, by a validating parser, a first syntax

level for validating syntax elements when parsing syntax of an input document [the

entire document is validated] (see [0037]), including the further limitations wherein the

first schema definition is identified in the input document (see [0037]) and obtaining an

input document to be validated and parsed for the client (see [0038], lines 1-3).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention to utilize the method of Chandler for identifying the syntax level with the input

document of Bogdan. One would have been motivated to do so in order to increase

efficiency by providing only necessary elements to the application through the use of an

identified syntax level, thereby decreasing the amount of information received by the

application.

While Bogdan/Chandler discloses application specific generation of objects (Bogdan: see column 3, lines 27-42), Bogdan/Chandler fails to explicitly disclose the further limitation of responsive to the validating of the syntax elements, parsing the validated syntax elements to generate the output for the consuming application according to the second schema definition, wherein the second schema definition is a base schema from which the extended schema was extended, thereby suppressing at least one of the validated syntax elements when generating the output for the consuming application, from the input document with the provided validating parser, for use by the client, wherein: the generated output has syntax that conforms to the syntax abstraction level that has been dynamically selected by the client. Slaughter discloses the concept of a space containing a base schema and a plurality of schema extensions, including the further limitation of responsive to the validating of the syntax elements, parsing the validated syntax elements to generate the output for the consuming application according to the second schema definition, wherein the second schema definition is a base schema from which the extended schema was extended, thereby suppressing at least one of the validated syntax elements when generating the output for the consuming application, from the input document with the provided validating parser, for use by the client, wherein: the generated output has syntax that conforms to the syntax abstraction level that has been dynamically selected by the client (see column 45, lines 4-35).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to utilize the limiting feature of Slaughter in order to limit the output of

Bogdan/Chandler to contain only objects that conform to the base schema. One would have been motivated to do so in order to provide different levels of service to different clients depending on the client's authentication.

Referring to claim 32, Bogdan discloses a computer-implemented method of applying abstraction by a validating parser, comprising steps of:

Bogdan discloses using, by a validating parser, a first schema definition syntax level for validating syntax elements when parsing syntax of an input document (see column 2, line 56 – column 3, line 44); and

the first schema definition is an extended schema (see column 2, line 56 – column 3, line 44); and

the second schema definition is a base schema from which the extended schema is extended, such that the extended schema defines at least one syntax element that is not defined in the base schema (see column 2, line 56 – column 3, line 44).

Bogdan fails to explicitly disclose the further limitation wherein the first schema definition is identified in the input document. Chandler discloses using, by a validating parser, a first syntax level for validating syntax elements when parsing syntax of an input document [the entire document is validated] (see [0037]), including the further limitation wherein the first schema definition is identified in the input document (see [0037]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to utilize the method of Chandler for identifying the syntax level with the input document of Bogdan. One would have been motivated to do so in order to increase

efficiency by providing only necessary elements to the application through the use of an
identified syntax level, thereby decreasing the amount of information received by the
application.

While Bogdan/Chandler discloses application specific generation of objects
(Bogdan: see column 3, lines 27-42), Bogdan/Chandler fails to explicitly disclose the
further limitation of omitting, by the validating parser, at least one of the validated syntax
elements when generating output from the parsed syntax of the input document, each of
at least one of the validated wherein each of the omitted syntax elements which is valid
according to the first schema definition syntax level but is not valid according to a
second schema definition syntax level for which the output is generated. Slaughter
discloses the concept of a space containing a base schema and a plurality of schema
extensions, including the further limitation of omitting, by the validating parser, at least
one of the validated syntax elements when generating output from the parsed syntax of
the input document, each of at least one of the validated wherein each of the omitted
syntax elements which is valid according to the first schema definition syntax level but is
not valid according to a second schema definition syntax level for which the output is
generated, wherein (see column 45, lines 4-35).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the
invention to utilize the limiting feature of Slaughter in order to limit the output of
Bogdan/Chandler to contain only objects that conform to the base schema. One would
have been motivated to do so in order to provide different levels of service to different
clients depending on the client's authentication.

Referring to claim 33, Bogdan/Chandler/Slaughter discloses method according to Claim 32, wherein the second syntax level schema definition is dynamically requested, to the validating parser, by an application program for which the output is being generated (Bogdan: see column 3, lines 27-42).

Response to Arguments

5.   Applicant's arguments with respect to the claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Contact Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to KIMBERLY LOVEL whose telephone number is (571)272-2750. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 - 4:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Cottingham can be reached on (571) 272-7079. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/John R. Cottingham/   /Kimberly Lovel/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2167   Examiner
                                                        Art Unit 2167

3 January 2008
/kl/